APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,973	12/05/2001	Paul R. Nash	41003.P086X	8414

25943   7590   10/18/2005

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.
PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900
1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER
PHILLIPS, HASSAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 August 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-65* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-65* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to communications filed on August 8, 2005.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 8, 2005 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed August 8, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued that Walden's teaching is limited to using URL to retrieve additional information, which is the basic purpose and usage of URL. Applicant further argued this is not the same as the required "providing assistance to information browsing based on the content of a locator of an information page recited in independent claims 1, 19, 35, and 50. Examiner respectfully submits that Applicant has misinterpreted the prior art of record, and has misread previous actions submitted by Examiner.

4. Regarding Applicant's arguments, Examiner expressed in previous office actions that Kannan teaches determining based at least in part on a locator of a first information page requested to be retrieved and displayed, whether to provide information browsing assistance, said locator identifying the first information page and a location from which the first information page is to be retrieved, and conditionally providing said information browsing assistance based at least in part on said determination, (page 7, paragraph 91). Kannan further gives examples of providing assistance to information browsing based at least in part on a locator of a first information page where Kannan teaches providing assistance to information browsing when a user switches back and forth between web pages, or is idle at a particular web page, (page 2, paragraph 25, page 14, paragraph 185). Although the teachings of Kannan strongly suggest that assistance is provided based on the "content" of a locator of a particular web page, such a teaching is not expressly stated. Thus, Examiner supplied the teachings of Walden to expressly show that browsing assistance can be provided based on the "content" of a locator. As acknowledged by Applicant in the remarks, retrieving information based on the content of a locator was well known in the art at the time of the invention, as this is the basic purpose of a URL. Thus, if not implicit in the teachings of Kannan, as mentioned in previous actions, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Kannan to show determining whether to provide browsing assistance based on content of a locator. This would have advantageously facilitated providing browsing assistance to

customers of a web site in a timely fashion, Walden col. 4, lines 9-14, Kannan, page 2,

paragraph 25, page 14, paragraph 185.

5. Furthermore, the Examiner has interpreted the claim language as broadly as

possible. It is also the Examiner's position that Applicant has not yet submitted claims

drawn to limitations, which define the operation and apparatus of Applicant's disclosed

invention in a manner that distinguishes over the prior art. Failure for Applicant to

significantly narrow definition/scope of the claims implies the Applicant intends broad

interpretation be given to the claims. The Examiner has interpreted the claims with

scope parallel to the Applicant in the response and reiterated the need for Applicant to

define the claimed invention more clearly and distinctly. Accordingly the references

supplied by the examiner in the previous office action covers the claimed limitations.

The rejections are thus sustained. Applicant is requested to review the prior art of

record for further consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-4, 9-12, 16-22, 25-27, 31-39, 42- 44, 48-53, 56-58, 62-65, are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kannan U.S. Patent Pub.

No. 2001/0054064, in view of Walden et al. (hereinafter Walden), U.S. Patent

6,456,303.

8. In considering claims 1 and 19, Kannan teaches a method and apparatus

comprising: determining based at least in part on a locator of a first information page

requested to be retrieved and displayed on a client system, whether to provide

information browsing assistance for the first information page, said locator identifying

the first information page and a location from which the first information page is to be

retrieved, (page 2, paragraph 25, page 7, paragraph 91, page 14, paragraph 185); and

conditionally providing said information browsing assistance based at least in part on

said determination, (page 2, paragraph 25, page 7, paragraph 91, page 14, paragraph

185).

Although the disclosed teachings of Kannan show substantial features of the

claimed invention they fail to expressly disclose: determining, based on content of a

locator, whether to provide browsing assistance.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor, Walden teaches a method and

system for accessing online information comprising: using the content of a locator of an

information page requested to be retrieved and displayed to provide information

browsing assistance, (col. 4, lines 14-18).

Thus, if not implicit in the teachings of Kannan, given the teachings of Walden, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Kannan to show determining, based on content of a locator, whether to provide browsing assistance. This would have advantageously facilitated providing browsing assistance to customers of a web site in a timely fashion, Walden col. 4, lines 9-14, Kannan, page 2, paragraph 25, page 14, paragraph 185.

9. In considering claims 2, 20, 36, and 51, Kannan teaches the locator comprising a uniform resource locator (URL). See page 7, paragraph 91.

10. In considering claims 3 and 21, Kannan teaches the determining comprising analyzing whether a locator based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met. See page 7, paragraph 91.

11. In considering claims 4 and 22, Kannan teaches the locator comprising a URL, and the determining comprising analyzing whether the URL satisfies a URL based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met. See page 7, paragraph 91.

12. In considering claim 9, Kannan further teaches downloading the URL based conditions and their corresponding information browsing assistance specifications from a server system onto the client system. See page 6, paragraph 74.

13. In considering claims 10 and 25, Kannan further teaches the information browsing assistance comprising displaying a second information page. See page 2, paragraph 25.

14. In considering claims 11, 26, 43, and 57, Kannan teaches the second information page effectively replacing the first information page. See page 2, paragraph 25.

15. In considering claims 12, 27, 44, and 58, Kannan teaches a second information page additionally displayed complementing a first information page. See page 2, paragraph 25.

16. In considering claims 16 and 31, it is implicit in the teachings of Kannan that a request to retrieve and display the first information page is received, the request including the locator. See page 2, paragraph 22.

17. In considering claims 17, 32, 48, and 62, Kannan teaches in response to said receive of a request, notifying a monitor function of a browser helper of said receipt, (page. 2, paragraph 22); and said monitor function, in response to receipt of said notification, notifying an analyzer function of said browser helper, which performs said

determining and conditional provision of information browsing assistance, (page 7,

paragraphs 83-84).

18. In considering claims 18, 33, and 63, Kannan teaches executing the monitor

function as an extension of a browser, and executing the analyzer function external to

the browser. See page 7, paragraphs 83-84.

19. In considering claim 34, Kannan teaches the apparatus being a selected one

of a wireless telephone, a palm sized personal digital assistant, a notebook computer, a

desktop computer, and a set top box. See Fig. 1.

20. In considering claims 35 and 64, Kannan teaches a method and computer

readable medium comprising: receiving a request from a client system for executable

instructions designed to enable the client system to conditionally provide information

browsing assistance based at least in part on a locator of a first information page

requested to be retrieved and displayed, said location identifying said first information

page and a location from which said first information page is to be retrieved; and in

response, providing said client system with said requested executable instructions,

(page 2, paragraph 22).

Although the disclosed teachings of Kannan show substantial features of the

claimed invention they fail to expressly disclose: determining, based on content of a

locator, whether to provide browsing assistance.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor, Walden teaches a method and

system for accessing online information comprising: using the content of a locator of an

information page requested to be retrieved and displayed to provide information

browsing assistance, (col. 4, lines 14-18).

Thus, given the teachings of Walden, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Kannan to show determining, based

on content of a locator, whether to provide browsing assistance. This would have

facilitated providing more timely help information to computer users, Walden col. 4, lines

9-14).

21. In considering claim 37, Kannan teaches performing a selected one of (a)

enabling the client system to determine whether a locator based condition for providing

information browsing assistance is met, and (b) enabling the client system to provide

said locator to a server system for the server system to determine for said client system

whether a locator based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met.

See page 7, paragraph 91.

22. In considering claim 38, Kannan teaches the server system being the same

server system performing the receiving and the responsive providing. See Fig. 5A, and

Fig. 6.

23. In considering claim 39, Kannan teaches the locator comprising a URL; and

said executable instructions designed to perform a selected one of (a) enable the client

system to determine whether said URL satisfies a URL based condition for providing

information browsing assistance is met, and (b) enable the client system to provide said

URL to a server system for the server system to determine for said client system

whether a locator based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met.

See page 7, paragraph 91.

24. In considering claim 42, Kannan further teaches either (a) said executable

instructions designed to enable the client system to provide said information browsing

assistance by displaying a second information page, or (b) the method further

comprising a server system providing said information browsing assistance to said client

system by causing a second information page to be displayed on said client system.

See page 2, paragraph 25.

25. In considering claim 49, Kannan teaches either (a) said browser helper further

includes said analyzer function to perform said conditional provision of information

browsing assistance, in response to receipt of said notification, or (b) the method further

includes a server having said analyzer function to perform said conditional provision of

information browsing assistance for said client system, in response to receipt of said

notification from said client system. See page 7, paragraphs 83-84.

26. In considering claims 50 and 65, Kannan teaches a server system and computer readable medium comprising: storage medium having stored therein at least a selected one of (a) first executable instructions designed to enable a first client system to conditionally provide information browsing assistance to itself based at least in part on a first locator of a first information page requested to be retrieved and displayed, and second executable instructions designed to provide the first client system with said first executable instructions in response to a request by the first client system for said first executable instructions, and (b) third executable instructions designed to enable the server system to conditionally provide information browsing assistance to a second client system based at least in part on a second locator of a second information page requested to be retrieved and displayed for said second client system, said first and second locators identifying said first and second information pages, and a first and a second location from which said first and second information pages are to be retrieved respectively; and at least one processor coupled to the storage medium to execute at least one of said second and third executable instructions, (page 2, paragraph 22).

Although the disclosed teachings of Kannan show substantial features of the claimed invention they fail to expressly disclose: determining, based on content of a locator, whether to provide browsing assistance.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor, Walden teaches a method and system for accessing online information comprising: using the content of a locator of an information page requested to be retrieved and displayed to provide information browsing assistance, (col. 4, lines 14-18).

Thus, given the teachings of Walden, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Kannan to show determining, based on content of a locator, whether to provide browsing assistance. This would have facilitated providing more timely help information to computer users, Walden col. 4, lines 9-14).

27. In considering claim 52, Kannan teaches said first executable instructions designed to enable the first client system to determine whether a first locator based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met, and said third executable instructions designed to enable the server system to determine for said second client system whether a second locator based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met. See page 7, paragraph 91.

28. In considering claim 53, Kannan teaches said first and second locators comprising a first and second URL; said first executable instructions designed to enable the first client system to determine whether said first URL satisfies a first URL based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met; and said third executable instructions designed to enable the server system to determine for said second client system whether a second URL satisfies a second URL based condition for providing information browsing assistance is met. See page 7, paragraph 91.

29. In considering claim 56, Kannan further teaches said first executable

instructions designed to enable the first client system to provide said information

browsing assistance by displaying a second information page; and said third executable

instructions designed to enable the server system to provide said information browsing

assistance to said client system by causing a second information page to be displayed

on said client system. See page 2, paragraph 25.

30. Claims 5-8, 23, 24, 40, 41, 54, 55, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Kannan and Walden, in view of Wolfe, U.S. Patent 6,397,246.

31. In considering claims 5, 23, 40, and 54, Kannan further discloses a URL

based condition comprising a pattern of URLs visited specifying a history of visited

URLs, (page 7, paragraphs 83-84); and, the analysis comprising matching a URL

against URL history, (page 7, paragraph 91).

Although the disclosed method taught by Kannan shows substantial features of

the claimed invention, it fails to expressly disclose: matching the URL against URL

patterns.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Wolfe teaches a method and system

for processing document requests in a network comprising: a URL based condition

comprising a URL pattern specifying a family of URLs, (col. 5, lines 21-31); and, an

analysis means comprising matching the URL against a plurality of URL patterns, (col.

5, lines 32-50).

Thus, given the teachings of Wolfe, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to modify the teachings of Kannan with Wolfe in order to have each URL based condition comprise a URL pattern specifying a family of URLs, and the analysis comprise matching the URL against a plurality of URL patterns. Doing so would have provided an efficient means for providing assistance specifically tailored for the user depending on URL patterns entered by the user, Wolfe, col. 4, line 49 through col. 5, line 20, Kannan, page 2, paragraph 19.

32. In considering claims 6, 24, 41, and 55, the teachings of Wolfe provide a means for each URL pattern to comprise a plurality of portions correspondingly stored in a plurality of nodes of a tree data structure, with the plurality of nodes having a child leaf node specifying information to be provided, wherein matching comprises traversing the tree data structure. One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kannan with Wolfe to have each URL pattern comprise a plurality of portions correspondingly stored in a plurality of nodes of a tree data structure, with the plurality of nodes having a child leaf node specifying information browsing assistance to be provided, and said matching comprise traversing said tree data structure, for the same reasons indicated in consideration of claims 5, 23, 40, and 54.

33. In considering claim 7, the teachings of Kannan disclose a means for

downloading the tree data structure from a server system onto the client system. See

page 5, paragraph 65.

34. In considering claim 8, the teachings of Kannan disclose a means for

downloading the URL patterns and their corresponding information browsing assistance

specifications from a server system onto the client system. See page 5, paragraph 65.

35. Claims 13, 28, 45, 59, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Kannan and Walden, in view of Peercy et al. (hereinafter Peercy),

U.S. Patent 5,960,429, (Applicant Admitted Prior Art).

36. In considering claims 13, 28, 45, and 59, although the disclosed method

taught by Kannan shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to

expressly. disclose: the second information page comprising a plurality of locators.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Peercy teaches: displaying a plurality

of locators identifying a plurality of information pages and corresponding locations from

which the identified information pages are to be retrieved, (col. 1, lines 45-59).

Thus, given the teachings of Peercy, it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to modify the teachings of

Kannan with Peercy in order to have the second information page comprise a plurality

of locators identifying a plurality of information pages and corresponding locations from

which the identified information pages of the second information page are to be

retrieved. This would have provided an efficient means for giving the user a choice of

popular information pages to choose from for browsing assistance, Peercy, col. 1, lines

35-41, Kannan, page 2, paragraph 19.

37. Claims 14, 15, 29, 30, 46, 47, 60, 61, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Kannan and Walden, in view of Blumenthal, U.S. Patent

6,026,409, (see Applicant IDS).

38. In considering claims 14, 29, 46, and 60, although the disclosed method

taught by Kannan shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to

expressly disclose: modifying one or more environment attributes of the browsing

environment.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Blumenthal teaches: modifying an

environment attribute of a browsing environment, (col. 5, line 50 through col. 6, line 6).

Thus, given the teachings of Blumenthal, it would have been obvious to a person

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to modify the teachings of

Kannan with Blumenthal in order to have the information browsing assistance comprise

modifying one or more environment attributes of the browsing environment within which

the determining and conditional provision of information browsing assistance are

performed. This would have provided an effective means for demarcating points of

interest in the browsing environment that correspond to the information browsing

assistance, Blumenthal, col. 5, lines 45-47, Kannan, page 2, paragraph 19.

39. In considering claims 15, 30, 47, and 61, Blumenthal teaches one or more

environment attributes comprising one or more of a display resolution attribute, a color

resolution attribute, a font selection attribute, a media player preference attribute, an

add-on selection attribute, and a plug-in selection attribute. See Blumenthal, col. 5, line

50 through col. 6, line 6. One of ordinary skill in the art would modify the teachings of

Kannan with Blumenthal for the reasons indicated in consideration of claims 14, 29, 46,

and 60.

Conclusion

40. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is (571)

272-3940. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER